

Quantum algorithm to calculate electromagnetic scattering cross sections

B. D. Clader,* B. C. Jacobs, and C. R. Sprouse

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, MD 20723, USA

We describe a quantum algorithm that generalizes the quantum linear system algorithm [Harrow *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 150502 (2009)] to arbitrary problem specifications. We develop a new state preparation routine and show how simple ancilla measurements can efficiently estimate the overlap between the linear system solution and an arbitrary state vector. To demonstrate the algorithm's applicability, we show how it can be used to compute the electromagnetic scattering cross section of an arbitrary target, using the finite element method. This quantum algorithm can provide exponential speedup over the best classical algorithm, greatly improving the runtime and allowing for the modeling of far more complex objects than possible on a classical computer.

The potential power of quantum computing was first described by Feynman, who showed that the exponential growth of the Hilbert space of a quantum computer allows efficient simulations of quantum systems, whereas a classical computer would be quickly overwhelmed [1]. Shor extended the applicability of quantum computing when he developed a quantum factorization algorithm that also provides an exponential speedup over the best classical algorithm [2]. More recently, Harrow *et al.* [3] demonstrated a quantum algorithm for solving a linear system of equations, which in certain cases gives exponential speedup over the best classical method.

The importance of linear system solving in scientific computing is well known, and the Quantum Linear Systems Algorithm (QLSA) represents a potential breakthrough in solving this class of problems using quantum computing techniques with exponential speedup. Prospects for implementation of the QLSA have been limited, however, by outstanding issues in state preparation (still, in general, an unsolved problem [4–8]), nonunitarity, and solution read-out not addressed in the original paper. These create substantial hurdles in finding applications where exponential speedup is possible.

Here, we present an algorithm that builds on the core of the QLSA, but with additions and modifications that address the issues of state-preparation, unitarity, and read-out necessary to implement the algorithm for practical applications. We develop a method to prepare arbitrary state vectors compatible with the QLSA. Additionally, the QLSA requires a measurement prior to accessing information from the solution, preventing the ability to use it as a quantum subroutine; we develop a technique that avoids use of non-unitary projections. To illustrate the functionality of our algorithm, we show how one can use it to solve for the scattering cross section of an object using the finite element method [9]. Additionally, we demonstrate how one can access the solution in sub-exponential time, thus preserving the exponential speed-up generated by the algorithm.

In the original QLSA paper of Harrow *et al.* [3], the authors demonstrated a quantum algorithm that could invert a sparse matrix to solve the quantum linear system

$A|x\rangle = |b\rangle$, exponentially faster than the best classical algorithm in certain situations. The only requirements were that the elements of A and $|b\rangle$ can be efficiently computable and the matrix A needs to be sparse, or efficiently decomposable into sparse form.

Unfortunately, the original algorithm had a few features that made it difficult to apply to a finite element scattering computation, and problems of practical interest in general. Creating the vector $|b\rangle$ generically is an unsolved problem, and no mention on how one might do this was provided. Additionally their implementation was not unitary. The final step required a successful outcome of a projective measurement to ensure that the quantum state stored the solution. This gave rise to a third more subtle issue related to extracting information from the solution. Since the solution was stored in a quantum state, measurement of it is impractical. For most problems of general interest, the QLSA would be used as a controlled subroutine, making the original implementation impossible because of the projective measurement. Therefore in our algorithm, we remove the measurement in order to make the algorithm useable as a controlled unitary operator. We anticipate this method being useful for other algorithms that make use of the QLSA such as the quantum data fitting algorithm [10].

The basic outline of the algorithm proceeds as follows. First we create the quantum state $|b\rangle$, containing the normalized right hand side of the linear system, with the known values contained in the quantum amplitudes. Although progress has been made in this area [4–8], efficient quantum state preparation is not in general possible for arbitrary states. Within the QLSA we are able to solve this by instead preparing the state

$$|b_T\rangle = \cos \phi_b |\tilde{b}\rangle|0\rangle + \sin \phi_b |b\rangle|1\rangle \quad (1)$$

that contains our desired arbitrary state, $|b\rangle$, entangled with an ancilla qubit in state $|1\rangle$. This can be done efficiently in the following manner. We initialize three quantum registers and an ancilla qubit as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |j\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle. \quad (2)$$

An oracle is queried that calculates the amplitude and phase components, denoted as b_j and ϕ_j respectively, of the vector $|b\rangle$, controlled off the value in the first register. Next, apply a controlled phase gate to the ancilla qubit in the fourth register, controlled by the calculated value of the phase, and finally rotate the fourth ancilla qubit conditioned on the calculated value of the amplitude, and uncompute registers 2 and 3 leaving

$$|\Psi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} e^{i\phi_j} |j\rangle \left(\sqrt{1 - C_b^2 b_j^2} |0\rangle + C_b b_j |1\rangle \right), \quad (3)$$

where $C_b = 1/\max(b_j)$ to ensure that all rotations are less than 2π . State (3) is exactly the state (1) with $\sin^2 \phi_b = \frac{C_b^2}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} b_j^2$ and $\cos^2 \phi_b = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (1 - C_b^2 b_j^2)$. This technique prepares the desired state $|b\rangle$ entangled to an ancilla qubit with value $|1\rangle$ as well as a garbage state, denoted by the tilde, entangled to the ancilla with value $|0\rangle$. This state can be prepared efficiently so long as the unitary operator used to compute b_j and ϕ_j is efficient.

Next, we apply the QLSA to the state $|b_T\rangle$. We modify the original algorithm by removing the last post-selection step, such that the our implementation is unitary. This gives the state

$$|\Psi\rangle = (1 - \sin^2 \phi_b \sin^2 \phi_x)^{1/2} |\Phi_0\rangle + \sin \phi_b \sin \phi_x |x\rangle |1\rangle |1\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where ϕ_x a normalization term resulting from the QLSA, $|\Phi_0\rangle$ is a garbage state in an expanded Hilbert space spanned by the solution vector and two ancilla qubits which are not in the state $|1\rangle$ simultaneously, and $|x\rangle$ is the normalized solution to the linear systems problem entangled with two ancilla qubits in the state $|1\rangle$. This step is the most computationally expensive part, since it requires a Hamiltonian simulation of the matrix A , which in its most general form requires $\tilde{O}(\kappa/\epsilon)$ sequential operations, where κ is the condition number of the matrix A and ϵ is the desired accuracy of the solution. The tilde denotes that we have neglected more slowly growing terms, similar to the usage in Harrow *et al.* [3].

Next we prepare the state $|R_T\rangle = \cos \phi_r |\tilde{R}\rangle |0\rangle + \sin \phi_r |R\rangle |1\rangle$ using the same method we used to prepare the state $|b_T\rangle$. We adjoin this state to Eq. (4) along with a fourth ancilla qubit initialized to state $|0\rangle$. We apply a Hadamard gate to the fourth ancilla qubit, and use it to perform a controlled swap operation between the registers containing the solution vector $|x\rangle$ and the propagation vector $|R\rangle$, followed by a second Hadamard operation on the ancilla. In doing so, we can compute the dot product between $|x\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ as

$$|\langle R|x\rangle|^2 = \frac{P_{1110} - P_{1111}}{\sin^2 \phi_b \sin^2 \phi_x \sin^2 \phi_r}, \quad (5)$$

where P_{1110} and P_{1111} refer to the probability of measuring a 1 in the first three ancilla qubits, and a 0 or 1 in

the last adjoined ancilla respectively. Because all of the techniques used for state preparation and linear system solving are unitary, all of the various amplitudes that are needed to compute $|\langle R|x\rangle|^2$ can be estimated using Amplitude Estimation (AE) [11]. A convenient feature of the formalism presented here, is that the Grover oracle needed by AE to estimate the various state amplitudes in Eq. (5) is trivial to construct. It requires only Z and X gates to implement, since the sign change depends only on the value of the ancilla qubits (see supplementary material for a detailed explanation).

We now show how our algorithm can achieve exponential speedup over the best classical algorithm. On a classical computer the runtime is dominated by the linear systems solving operation that requires many matrix vector products. The best sparse-matrix solving algorithm, conjugate gradient, is $O[Nd\kappa \log(1/\epsilon)]$ for the scattering problem presented here, where d is the number of non-zero entries per row and κ is the condition number of the matrix, while ϵ is the desired precision of the calculation.

The quantum algorithm requires only $O(1)$ oracle queries to create the $|b\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ states. Estimation of $\sin^2 \phi_b$ and $\sin^2 \phi_r$ requires $O(1/\epsilon)$ iterations to estimate to accuracy ϵ with AE. The QLSA requires Hamiltonian simulation to invert A . Berry *et al.* [12] show that when using the Suzuki higher order integrator method [13], this step requires $N_{\text{exp}} \leq 2m^2\tau \exp(2\sqrt{\ln 5 \ln(m\tau/\epsilon)})$ exponential operator applications, where m is the number of sub-matrices needed to decompose the sparse matrix A into 1-sparse form ($m = 6d^2$ using the decomposition technique in Ref. [12], where d is the sparsity of A), and τ is the length of time the matrix must be simulated times the matrix norm. For the algorithm to be accurate to within ϵ , Harrow *et al.* [3] showed that $\tau = O(\kappa/\epsilon)$. Since we estimate ϕ_x using AE, multiple applications of Hamiltonian simulation with different times are required. Thus, to estimate $\sin^2 \phi_x$ as well as P_{1110} and P_{1111} to accuracy ϵ takes $\tilde{O}(d^4 \kappa \log N/\epsilon^2)$ where the tilde again indicates that we are neglecting more slowly growing terms. Our implementation is quadratically better in κ than in the original QLSA due to our removal of the post-selection step.

Combining all steps, the overall quantum algorithm has $\tilde{O}(d^4 \kappa \log N/\epsilon^2)$ complexity. In situations where the condition number scales as $\text{poly} \log(N)$ the quantum algorithm is exponentially faster than the best classical algorithm. However, even if this is not the case, one is not restricted to inverting the matrix A as is. Most solvers precondition the matrix in some manner to improve the conditioning of the matrix. Indeed certain preconditioners are known to reduce the condition number to $\text{poly} \log(N)$ scaling [14, 15]. In addition, the form of the matrix A for many practical problems, is known ahead of time. This leaves open the possibility for much more efficient Hamiltonian simulation than the Trotterization method, suggesting greatly improved runtime for specific

problems, also leading to exponential speedup.

To demonstrate the algorithm's applicability we now show how it can be used to calculate the electromagnetic scattering cross section of an arbitrary target. Calculation of the scattering cross section is routinely used in the electromagnetics modeling community to characterize detectability by radar. In particular, the calculations are used to drive design considerations of low-observable (stealth) objects. The Finite Element Method (FEM) is a numerical technique for solving partial differential equations that has been applied to a vast array of problems in mathematics, the physical sciences, and other fields [9]. In the FEM, a collection of non-overlapping *finite elements* are used to approximate the solution domain. These elements are typically simple geometric shapes such as triangles or quadrilaterals in two-dimensional spaces and tetrahedra or hexahedra in three-dimensions. The fields that satisfy the differential equations are represented by a weighted sum of basis functions defined on the elements. Along with appropriate boundary conditions, the problem can then be cast into a linear system of equations.

The FEM can be used as a *full-wave* solver that converge to the solution of the continuous problem as the discretization length goes to zero. For discretization lengths significantly smaller than the length of variation in the domain and fields, full-wave solvers provide nearly exact solutions. These full-wave methods can be contrasted with methods using approximate physics, such as the Uniform Theory of Diffraction (UTD) for electromagnetics [16]. The UTD uses ray optics for propagation and scattering from smooth surfaces and accounts for edge diffraction by incorporating the analytic solution to scattering of a plane wave from an infinite wedge. Although the UTD provides an excellent approximation for high-frequency scattering from simple geometries, it breaks down for low frequencies (when ray-optics no longer applies) and complex geometries (where simple edge diffraction is not the main contributor to scattering). When applicable, approximate methods are typically much more computationally efficient than full-wave solvers. It is clear however, that efficient full-wave solvers are still critical for more complex problems.

The FEM approach to solving an electromagnetic scattering problem is to break up the computational domain into small volume elements and apply boundary conditions at neighboring elements. This allows one to cast the solution of Maxwell's equations into a linear system

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}. \quad (6)$$

The matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is constructed from a discretization of Maxwell's equation together with appropriate boundary conditions due to the scattering object under consideration. The vector $\mathbf{b}$ consists of the known electric field components on the scattering boundary. The matrix $\mathbf{A}$, which contains information about the scattering object,

can be efficiently derived from the components of a matrix $\mathbf{F}$ that is dependent only upon the form of the discretization chosen to break up the computational domain and not the scattering object (see e.g. Ref. [9] and the included supplementary material). Edge basis vectors [17], denoted as $\mathbf{N}_i$, are highly popular for electromagnetic scattering applications. They give a form of $\mathbf{F}$ as

$$F_{lj} = \int_V [(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}_l) \cdot (\nabla \times \mathbf{N}_j) - k^2 \mathbf{N}_l \cdot \mathbf{N}_j] dV \quad (7) \\ + ik \int_S (\mathbf{N}_l)_t \cdot (\mathbf{N}_j)_t dS,$$

where V is the volume of the computational region, S is the outer surface of the computational region, k is the electric field wavenumber, the subscript t denotes the tangential component, and the indices l and j denote the numbering of all the edges contained in the volume V . The surface integral is an absorbing term used to prevent reflections off the artificial computational boundary. For simplicity we assume a first order boundary condition; however, that limitation is not required for the quantum algorithm. On the inner scattering surface the correct boundary condition for the scattered field on metallic scatterers is $\hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \mathbf{E} = -\hat{\mathbf{n}} \times \mathbf{E}^{(i)}$, where $\mathbf{E}^{(i)}$ is the incident field, $\mathbf{E}$ is the scattered field, and $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is the unit vector normal to the surface is applied. The edge basis vectors are defined such that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{N}_i = 0$, which implies $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0$ and constant curl, making them valid basis functions to use for the electric field. A much more detailed explanation of the FEM construction can be found in the supplementary material.

The actual electric field at any point can be constructed from the linear system solution by interpolating with the edge basis vectors giving $\mathbf{E}^{(e)}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{N}_i^{(e)} x_i^{(e)}$. Here the superscript (e) denotes the particular element in which the field is being calculated, and n is the number of edges of the element. The radiated electric field in the far-field at position $\mathbf{s}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{e^{-iks}}{4\pi s} \int_S \{ i\omega\mu_0 \hat{\mathbf{s}} \times [\hat{\mathbf{s}} \times \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r})] \\ + ik\hat{\mathbf{s}} \times \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}) \} e^{ik\hat{\mathbf{s}} \cdot \mathbf{r}} dS, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv -(i\omega\mu_0)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{r}) \times \nabla \times \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}) \times \hat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{r})$, with $\hat{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{r})$ the unit normal of the surface S at $\mathbf{r}$. Using the edge basis expansion gives

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{e^{-iks}}{4\pi s} \sum_k R_k(\hat{\mathbf{s}}) x_k, \quad (9)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ is the radar polarization (with $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{s}} = 0$) and

$$R_k(\hat{\mathbf{s}}, \hat{\mathbf{p}}) \equiv \hat{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \int_S \hat{\mathbf{s}} \times \{ \hat{\mathbf{s}} \times [(\nabla \times \mathbf{N}_k) \times \hat{\mathbf{n}}] \\ + ik\mathbf{N}_k \times \hat{\mathbf{n}} \} e^{ik\hat{\mathbf{s}} \cdot \mathbf{r}} dS, \quad (10)$$

where the index k here is the global edge index. The radar scattering cross-section (RCS) in the direction $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$ is given by

$$\text{RCS} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} 4\pi s^2 |\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{s}) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}|^2 = \frac{1}{4\pi} |\mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{x}|^2, \quad (11)$$

or simply the dot product of $\mathbf{R}$ with the solution $\mathbf{x}$, where we have assumed an incident plane wave with unit electric field amplitude without loss of generality.

The edge basis elements can take a simple functional form, which allows one to analytically evaluate the integrals in Eqs. (7) and (10). This allows for efficient computation of the matrix and vector elements, a requirement for the quantum algorithm. Because of the local nature of the finite element expansion, the volume and surface integrals extend only over the region encompassed by the finite element. As a result $\mathbf{A}$ is highly sparse, allowing an efficient decomposition into a 1-sparse form [12], also necessary for the quantum algorithm.

To obtain the cross section using the quantum algorithm one uses the oracles just presented to create the A matrix and $|b\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ state vectors. Then one must restore units to the normalized output received from the quantum algorithm. Doing so yields the following equation for the cross section in terms of outputs from the quantum computation

$$\text{RCS} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{N^2 \sin^2 \phi_b \sin^2 \phi_r}{C_b^2 C_r^2 \sin^2 \phi_x} (P_{1110} - P_{1111}), \quad (12)$$

where $C_b = 1/\max(\mathbf{b})$ and $C_r = 1/\max(\mathbf{R})$ are known parameters. Thus to compute the cross section, we estimate each $\sin^2 \phi_{(b,x,r)}$ term as well as the P_{1110} and P_{1111} terms independently using AE.

Finally we remark on the efficiency of the scattering cross section calculation. With no preconditioning, finite element condition numbers scale as $N^{2/n}$ [18, 19], where n is the number of dimensions of the problem, implying that even in the most general case our algorithm scales better than its classical counterpart for a three-dimensional finite element problems. However, as mentioned above there are likely quantum preconditioners or better simulation techniques that can further improve the quantum scaling to provide exponential speedup.

We have demonstrated a quantum algorithm that generalizes the QLSA to solve an arbitrary linear systems and estimate the overlap of the solution with an arbitrary state vector by simple ancilla amplitude measurements. To demonstrate its functionality we showed how one could use it to solve an electromagnetic scattering problem using the finite element method and estimate the scattering cross section. In the best case, where the Hamiltonian simulation or condition number scaling can be reduced to poly $\log(N)$, this algorithm has complexity

that is exponentially better than the best classical algorithm. This opens up the potential for quantum computing to be applied to a broad class of problems of practical interest to the computational physics community.

This project was supported by the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity via Department of Interior National Business Center contract numbers N00024-03-D-6606 and BOA 54127, with additional support provided by a Stuart S. Janney Fellowship. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright annotation thereon. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies or endorsements, either expressed or implied, of IARPA, DoI/NBC, or the U.S. Government. Many thanks to Joan Hoffmann and Nathan Wiebe for helpful comments and discussions.

* dave.clader@jhuapl.edu

- [1] R. Feynman, International Journal of Theoretical Physics, **21**, 467 (1982).
- [2] P. Shor, in *Foundations of Computer Science, 1994 Proceedings., 35th Annual Symposium on* (1994) pp. 124 – 134.
- [3] A. W. Harrow, A. Hassidim, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett., **103**, 150502 (2009).
- [4] L. Grover and T. Rudolph, arXiv:quant-ph/0208112v1 (2002).
- [5] D. Aharonov and A. Ta-Shma, in *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, STOC '03 (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2003) pp. 20–29.
- [6] N. J. Ward, I. Kassal, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, The Journal of Chemical Physics, **130**, 194105 (2009).
- [7] A. N. Soklakov and R. Schack, Phys. Rev. A, **73**, 012307 (2006).
- [8] P. Kaye and M. Mosca, arXiv:quant-ph/0407102v1 (2004).
- [9] J. Jin, *The Finite Element Method in Electromagnetics*, 2nd ed. (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2002).
- [10] N. Wiebe, D. Braun, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett., **109**, 050505 (2012).
- [11] G. Brassard, P. Hoyer, M. Mosca, and A. Tapp, arXiv.org:quant-ph/0005055 (2000).
- [12] D. Berry, G. Ahokas, R. Cleve, and B. Sanders, Communications in Mathematical Physics, **270**, 359 (2007).
- [13] M. Suzuki, Physics Letters A, **146**, 319 (1990).
- [14] Q. Hu and J. Zou, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, **41**, 1682 (2003).
- [15] A. Toselli, IMA J. of Num. An., **26**, 96 (2006).
- [16] R. Kouyoumjian and P. Pathak, Proceedings of the IEEE, **62**, 1448 (1974).
- [17] A. Chatterjee, J. Jin, and J. Volakis, Antennas and Propagation, IEEE Transactions on, **41**, 221 (1993).
- [18] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott, *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, 3rd ed. (Springer Verlag, New York, 2008) Chap. 9.6.
- [19] R. E. Bank and L. R. Scott, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, **26**, 1383 (1989).